

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1454 OF 2025**

Mohd. Tamanne Ansari alias Salman ...Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Mr. Ali Kaashif Khan Deshmukh a/w Ms. Snigdha Khandelwal, learned Advocates for the Applicant.

Mrs. Prajakta P. Shinde, learned A.P.P. for the State/Respondent.

PSI Mr. Sanjay Dalvi attached to Sion Police Station, Mumbai is present in the Court.

**CORAM : ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.
[VACATION COURT]**

DATE : 4th JUNE 2025.

P.C. :

1. Heard Mr. Ali Kaashif Khan Deshmukh alongwith Ms. Snigdha Khandelwal, learned Advocates for the Applicant and Ms. Prajakta Shinde, learned A.P.P. for the State/Respondent.

2. On 2nd June 2025, the Applicant had agreed to appear before the Investigating Officer, Sion Police Station, Mumbai with reference to the investigation. Mr. Ali Khan Deshmukh, learned Advocate for the Applicant states that the Applicant had attended the Sion Police Station, Mumbai on the date and time fixed and has co-operated with the investigation in the matter. He further states that the Applicant voluntarily surrendered the weapon, alleged to be used in the crime, to the Investigating Officer. He states that he

has co-operated with the investigation and shall co-operate with the Investigating Agency by appearing before the Investigating Officer as and when required.

3. Ms. Prajakta Shinde, learned A.P.P. for the State/Respondent on instructions from the PSI Mr. Sanjay Dalvi, Sion Police Station, Mumbai, who is present in the Court states that the Applicant had attended on 3rd June 2025 and has co-operated with the investigation. The Investigating Officer acknowledges the fact of the Applicant having surrendered the weapon, which is said to be used in the crime.

4. Ms. Prajakta Shinde, learned A.P.P. for the State/Respondent states that the Injury Certificate of the victim reveals the injury to be simple in nature.

5. In such circumstances, Ms. Prajakta Shinde, learned A.P.P. for the State/Respondent on instruction from the Investigating Officer states that the custodial interrogation of the Applicant is not required at this stage.

6. In view of the above statement made by the learned A.P.P. for the State/Respondent on instructions from the Investigating Officer, who is present in the Court, nothing survives in the present Application and the same is disposed of.

[ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.]

GITALAXMI
KRISHNA
KOTAWADEKAR

Digitally signed by
GITALAXMI KRISHNA
KOTAWADEKAR
Date: 2025.06.04
20:43:38 +0530